

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

RN023 (2635-020-03)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on April 30, 2009

Signature: /Renise Fung/

Typed or printed name Renise Fung

Application Number

09/550,545

Filed

April 14, 2000

First Named Inventor

Shawn Scotzin

Art Unit

2614

Examiner

Andrew C. Flanders

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

/CAWiklof/

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

Signature

Christopher A. Wiklof

Typed or printed name

☒ attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number 43,990

(425) 455-5575

Telephone number

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

4/30/2009

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.  
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☒ \*Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

## Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s) : Shawn Scotzin et al. Confirmation No. : 8286  
Application No. : 09/550,545 Group Art Unit : 2614  
Filing Date : April 14, 2000 Examiner : Andrew C. Flanders  
Docket No. : RN023 (2635-020-03) Customer No. : 72455  
Title : **SYSTEM AND METHOD OF PROVIDING MUSIC ITEMS TO MUSIC RENDERERS**

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF**

Applicant's agent requests the Review Panel to reconsider the application in view of this communication. Claims 91-110 are pending. Claims 91-110 are rejected.

**Rejection of claims 91-110 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Lau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,212) In View Of Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279)**

**Claim 91**

Claim 91 recites, in part, an electronic device that "display[s] a graphical user interface that includes a hierarchical library tree that graphically depicts a music renderer node and a music item node," and responsive to a GUI command "determines whether the format of the corresponding music track is compatible with the corresponding music renderer such that the music renderer can render music from the music track, [and] in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer, reformats the music track to a format that is compatible with the music renderer."

Lau discloses a graphical user interface. Li discloses an approach to transcoding. However, Li approaches transcoding differently and with poorer storage efficiency compared to the recitation of claim 91.

**37 CFR §1.8  
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system, EFS-Web, addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

/Renise Fung/  
Renise Fung

April 30, 2009  
Date

Li discloses saving media files in an "InfoPyramid" 280, depicted in Li, FIG. 2. "The InfoPyramid 280 can be viewed as a generalization of multi-resolution representations. . . The InfoPyramid 280 is a data structure in which the multiple representations of a multimedia item can be organized into a pyramid-like structure, as illustrated in FIG. 2. The cells of the pyramid correspond to different representations of the objects using different modalities . . . and fidelities such as in the range of full-resolution (bottom of pyramid) to low-resolution (top of pyramid)." [column 4, lines 50 to 66]

Li, FIG. 3 illustrates a flow chart showing adaptation of a multimedia document to a client device. "Content items 120 of a multimedia document 100 are transcoded (250) into multiple modality and fidelity versions to generate a set 340 of InfoPyramids 280." [column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 2] "A content adaptation process 350 uses the client profile 310 to select from among the InfoPyramids 280 the versions 374 that best satisfy the particular client profile. These selected versions are rendered into a document 370 which is an adaptation (i.e., customization) of the original multimedia document 100. The client device receives the customized document 370." [column 6, lines 42-48]

Thus, Li's "content adaptation process" does not include "in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer, reformat[ting] the music track to a format that is compatible with the music renderer," as recited by claim 91. Rather, Li first saves a music track into an "InfoPyramid" that includes multiple fidelities and modalities. Then (presumably in response to a request to transfer the track to a particular client device) Li selects, for example, from among the multiple fidelities a fidelity that is compatible with the client device, if any.

Li's approach to saving multiple fidelities and multiple modalities of multimedia objects apparently results in redundant storage of similar objects at different fidelities. This is counter to a stated embodiment of the present application "the system should automatically transform the music from its form at the source to a format which is required by the destination." [page 2, lines 19-21]

Since Lau apparently does not disclose transcoding at all, the combination of Lau and Li is similarly limited in that the only way disclosed to load a media file to a media player is to first save the information in an "InfoPyramid", and then select from among multiple fidelities and modalities for loading to the media player. Lau and Li, alone and

in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest “in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer, reformat[ing] the music track to a format that is compatible with the music renderer,” as recited by claim 91.

Accordingly, Lau and Li, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 91, and claim 91 is allowable over Lau and Li.

#### **Claims 92-95, 102-104**

Claims 92-95 and 102-104 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 91, and for at least the reasons given for claim 91.

#### **Claim 96**

Claim 96 recites a method including “in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer, reformatting the music track to a format that is compatible with the music renderer.”

Claim 96 is allowable over Lau and Li for reasons similar to those given for claim 91. Namely, the combination of Lau and Li discloses first saving multimedia objects in an “InfoPyramid” that includes multiple fidelities and multiple modalities. Then, during a “content adaptation process” one of a plurality of cells from the InfoPyramid is selected for downloading to an end device.

This is different than the recitation of claim 96, wherein the music track is reformatted. [emphasis added] Moreover, it is different than the recitation of claim 96 wherein the reformatting of the music track is made in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer. [emphasis added]

As with the explanation under claim 91, above, Li’s approach to saving multiple fidelities and multiple modalities of multimedia objects apparently results in redundant storage of similar objects at different fidelities. This is counter to a stated embodiment of the present application “the system should automatically transform the music from its form at the source to a format which is required by the destination.” [page 2, lines 19-21]

Accordingly, Lau and Li, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 96, and claim 96 is allowable over Lau and Li.

#### **Claims 97-100, 105-108**

Claims 97-100 and 105-108 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 96 and for at least the reasons given for claim 96.

### **Claim 101**

Claim 101 recites, in part, a computer-readable storage medium storing a program that, when executed by a computer, causes the computer to “display a graphical user interface that includes a hierarchical library tree that graphically depicts a music renderer node and a music item node,” and responsive to a GUI command “determine whether the format of the corresponding music track is compatible with the corresponding music renderer such that the music renderer can render music from the music track, [and] in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer, reformat the music track to a format that is compatible with the music renderer.”

Claim 101 is allowable for reasons similar to those given for claim 91. In particular, Lau and Li, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest “in response to a determination that the format is not compatible with the music renderer, reformat[ing] the music track to a format that is compatible with the music renderer,” as recited by claim 101.

Accordingly, Lau and Li, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 101, and claim 101 is allowable over Lau and Li.

### **Claims 109-110**

Claims 109-110 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 101 and for at least the reasons given for claim 101.

For reasons described above, the claims are now in condition for allowance,  
which is earnestly solicited.

DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/CAWiklof/

Christopher A. Wiklof  
Registration No. 43,990

Customer No. 72455

Graybeal Jackson Haley LLP  
155 - 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Suite 350  
Bellevue, Washington 98004-5973  
Telephone: 425.455.5575  
Facsimile: 425.455.1046